

leadership, made this country a better place.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### TRIBUTE TO DANIEL J. HOLLMANN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONAWAY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate a great American. Mr. Daniel J. Hollmann of Odessa, Texas, has been a community leader in Odessa and the Permian Basin for more than three decades. A small businessman, family man and steadfast volunteer, Dan is one of the shining stars in the Eleventh Congressional District of Texas.

April 1 of this year marks the 30th anniversary of Dan receiving his license to practice law and the founding of his own firm, now Hollmann, Lyon, Patterson and Durell. Reaching this milestone is a great achievement, and I congratulate him for showing the hard work and perseverance I know it takes to run a small business.

I would also like to recognize and congratulate Dan as the 2006 recipient of the Odessa Chamber of Commerce's Outstanding Citizen of the Year Award. The award, given to the chamber member who best represents the collective goals of the business community of Odessa, was given to Dan because of his extensive volunteer history to the community and involvement in volunteerism that led to this award.

He has donated legal services to various nonprofit organizations, including the Formation of Court Appointed Special Advocates of Ector County and Catholic Charities Community Services, and is a proud supporter of many public school booster clubs, ranging from the Permian High School Choir Booster Club to the Odessa High School Basketball Booster Club.

Again, I congratulate my friend Daniel J. Hollmann on all of these achievements and thank him for his continued service to our community. Other citizens should look to him as a role model, and I am proud to represent him in the United States Congress and to call him my friend.

PROPOSED TIME LINE FOR WITHDRAWAL OF U.S. FORCES FROM IRAQ

Mr. CONAWAY. Madam Speaker, on a different topic altogether, we have heard talk that the Democrats will bring forth the idea that we can set some sort of an artificial time line on when to get out of Iraq. I would argue there are really only two choices in this issue, and this third choice is false and misleading.

Here is the example: let's assume for the sake of this argument that Democrats decide in March of 2008 we need to stop this fight. I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, how do you look those family members in the eye whose loved ones are killed or maimed in March of 2008 and say, gee, if we had known in March of 2007 what we now know in March of 2008, that your loved one would have gotten killed, I might have thought a February 28 date was a better date.

Madam Speaker, we have no three choices. We have two choices, and they are honorable, in a sense. One is to fight this fight and win, which is the choice I believe is the correct one; or we simply raise the white flag, admit defeat, say that we have lost and get our troops out today. Anything short of that is untenable. The impact it has on the war fighter is obvious, ignoring, of course, the impact it has on the folks we oppose and the advantages it gives them. We simply cannot hamstring our fighters in this fight.

I cannot face families in July of this year or March of next year and say, gee, but for the calendar clicking off, your loved one would not have been at risk.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to pick sides in this fight. Either we fight it or we get out. Pick a side. There is no third alternative.

#### RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Education and Labor:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, March 9, 2007.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
Office of the Speaker,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER, Effective immediately, I hereby resign from my position on the House Committee for Education and Labor. I have gained much from my time served on this committee, and now look forward to serving the 110th Congress in other capacities.

Best regards,

BOB INGLIS.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SCHIFF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. WAXMAN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### MANNER OF CONDUCTING PROCEEDINGS IN THE 110TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, we have had I think a very eventful week here this week and accomplished a significant amount and had some intense debates here on the floor of this Congress. In my time here and in anybody's memory here, I don't think anyone remembers a time that there have been three motions to recommit that have actually succeeded and attached that new policy on to the bill that was prepared for final passage here on the floor. That makes it an eventful week.

Madam Speaker, I reflect here that at the beginning of the 110th Congress there were a lot of objections to a scoreboard vote board that was kept open when Republicans were in charge for the sake of being able to allow people to change their votes until everyone was satisfied. There were strong and loud and vociferous complaints to keeping that board open when it was the Republicans in charge.

I am not here to make a loud, vociferous objection to the Democrats keeping the board open, but I am here to point out that the shoe is on the other foot today, and today this motion to recommit went up on the board, and it had 147 Democrats that voted "no" on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit, what it did was said that no individual who has been issued a transportation worker identification card may board a maritime vessel if the individual has been convicted of or found not guilty by reason of insanity in a civilian or military jurisdiction of any of the following felonies. In other words, nobody is going to be boarding a maritime vessel if they are guilty of these crimes: espionage or conspiracy, sedition or conspiracy to commit sedition, treason,

and a number of other crimes along through the list one can imagine, distribution, manufacture, purchase receipt, dealing with explosives. In other words, terrorists, people who have been identified as terrorists, convicted as terrorists. The motion to recommit said no one will be boarding a maritime vessel that has those things on their record.

Upon the first vote that was up there, the peak came out to be 247 Democrats voting against a motion that would block those who have committed those violent crimes, those crimes against this country. Then the board was left open, and as minutes went by, and I didn't watch my watch, but I am going to suspect it was 20 to 25 minutes, I watched Democrats vote their convictions and then began to adjust to their convictions, and 111 Members changed their vote here, getting down from 147 that voted "no" to 56 that voted "no," and final passage became 359 to 56 on the passage of the motion to recommit.

So I point out that sometimes that criticism that comes when you are in the minority doesn't seem like when the shoe is on the other foot that the rules you claim should apply are the ones that actually apply when you find yourself in a position of making the rules.

I would point also out that the circumstance before the Rules Committee, since that word came out of my mouth, Madam Speaker, and in the Rules Committee, we brought rules before, there were rules that were brought before this full Congress and approved for the 110th Congress. This was going to be a 110th Congress with a new majority and a new Speaker and there was going to be sunshine on everything we did. There was going to be a level of integrity in the process that was here. There were great objections to the process we had, and there was going to be a change, a new era in government, which means more openness, more honesty, more reporting.

But written into the rule was an exemption for the Rules Committee, so they are not required to report the recorded votes within the Rules Committee.

Now, how is it that here we are a more open government, but we are writing in provisions that allow for more secrecy? And that is the fact, Madam Speaker. That is the fact that came before this Congress. That is the fact that many of us voted against on the rules package. That is the amendment that I brought before the Rules Committee a couple of days ago.

What is ironic about that is that I have to go and appeal to the same people that want the secrecy and ask them if they will let me have a vote here on the floor about taking away the secrecy they have assigned themselves. Of course, the people that sat in judgment, that assigned themselves the secrecy, said, no, we won't allow a debate on it; we won't allow a vote on it. We are going to maintain the secrecy. And,

by the way, it was offensive to them to have anyone raise the issue that they should be required to report the votes of the Rules Committee when there is a recorded vote.

So that amendment was denied. The American people were denied a debate. They were denied a vote and denied an opportunity to even judge whether this is a more open process or whether it has become a more closed process.

But I think these two instances that I brought up just this week, Madam Speaker, illustrate that the process is not more open, it is not cleaner, it is not with more sunshine on it, and it is not more reflective of the representation here in this Congress. There are other instances as well as I could go on, but I think that suffices to make my point.

Madam Speaker, I came here to talk about another issue that has been rolled out in the media yesterday and today, this issue of the supplemental appropriations bill that the President has asked for in order to fund our troops in Iraq and in Afghanistan.

The President has made a request so that we can provide adequate materials, supplies, training and equipment and munitions to our military that are on the front lines who put their lives on the line for our freedom. I am pledged to uphold that support for them. But what I see come out, at least with the report of the news with regard to the supplemental, has so many strings attached. This is an unprecedented attempt on the part of Congress to micromanage a shooting war.

Our Founding Fathers understood this, and they declared in the Constitution that the President is the Commander in Chief. They didn't write in the Constitution that the President will be presiding over a committee of 435 Members of Congress on the House side and 100 Senators on the Senate side and they shall be a committee that will micromanage the nuances of a war.

The Founding Fathers knew that you could not fight a war on consensus, that you can't fight it on majority vote. You have to have a Commander in Chief who is in charge. That was a clear understanding of history and human nature. It was reflected by our Founding Fathers into our Constitution, Madam Speaker. And yet to this day, I don't know how many Members of this Congress even understand how the Constitution controls the things that they do, even though every single one of us takes an oath to this Constitution at the beginning of every Congress.

Every 2 years we stand up and we say: "I pledge to uphold the Constitution of the United States." I do so here on the floor. I make that oath on a Bible.

□ 1500

Most don't because it is hard to remember to bring the Bible with you on that day, but most do go over and have

their picture taken ceremonially with their hand on the Bible. Well, I do both if I've got the time, but the one I don't miss is I bring the Bible to the floor and I take that oath, "so help me God," to uphold this Constitution.

And if it is inconvenient to have a provision in the Constitution, we have to live with it until it becomes so inconvenient that we are willing to amend it. But we do not have the authority here in this Congress to amend the Constitution, neither does the Supreme Court and neither does the commander in chief. The people of America have to ratify an amendment to the Constitution. And that is how the Founders saw it because they understood they were not creating a democracy, Madam Speaker. And if anybody is teaching out there in the classes of civics and government that go on all over America in nearly every school in America that we are blessed to be born and live in a democracy, I have to say, Madam Speaker, that is an erroneous lesson to be teaching our young people and to be perpetuating through the adults. And, in fact, a lot of the people in this Congress still believe this is a democracy.

Well, when Benjamin Franklin stepped out of the Constitutional Congress he was asked by a lady on the streets, "What have you produced?" And his answer was, "A republic, Madam, if you can keep it." And that is what we have. We have a constitutional republic because our Founders understood that if you went to the pure democracy form, and they studied the democracies of the city-states in Greece; in fact, I have been there to see the displays at the National Archives of the pottery that the Greeks had and their method of voting demagogues out of the city and banishing them for 7 years. And some of that system is still within our Greek system on our universities today.

The Greeks identified a demagogue as someone who was so skilled with their rhetoric, so moving and passionate in their delivery of their oratorical speeches, that they could move the masses by emotion rather than rationale. So they banished the demagogues from their city-states because it sent them down the path of emotion rather than deductive reasoning.

So the Founders understood that we didn't need to have the masses moving by emotion; they understood that the definition of a democracy was two wolves and a sheep taking a vote on what's for dinner. Majority rules; guess who's for dinner?

They wrote rights into our Constitution and into the Bill of Rights because they understood human nature, and they knew there had to be protections in place higher than a majority vote, higher than being in the majority. There had to be guaranteed constitutional rights for all citizens in this country on equal standing, drafted in, plugged into the Bill of Rights and ratified by the several States, and now

ratified by all of the States, the 50 States in the Union. Those guarantees must be in place.

This Constitution, Madam Speaker, means something. And the language in this Constitution means what it says. The text of this language means what it meant, means what it was understood to be when it was ratified. And if it is inconvenient or if we disagree with the fundamentals, we should amend it. We shouldn't ignore it.

This Constitution grants Congress, this body in particular I am speaking to, but also the Senate as well, only two authorities when it comes to war; number one is, first, I will state it again, the President is the commander in chief of all Armed Services. We didn't have an Air Force then, but that is implied. So that is the standard, Madam Speaker.

And then the Constitution grants Congress two different authorities when it comes to war: Number one, the authority to declare war. That has happened several times in our history, but the last time it happened was in the beginning of World War II.

The second constitutional authority Congress has is to fund the war. But what we are seeing come out of the Democrat side of this is to micromanage the war in such a way that they can squeeze down and constrict the commander in chief's authority and responsibility to conduct war. And that can only end in disaster for our troops and disaster for the destiny of our country.

But we do not have that authority to micromanage. We can appropriate to the Department of Defense. We can appropriate to the Department of Homeland Security and some other lesser departments within the fringes. But we don't have the authority to micromanage.

I am going to go further, Madam Speaker, and take this position, that if this Congress should decide that building a bunch of ICBM missiles and placing them in places, say, across the polar ice cap are a high priority and they appropriated the money for that and we found out that we were in a shooting war that flared up maybe in six different places in the world and we needed to spend that money for armored Humvees and bullet-proof vests and more M-4 machine guns or more surveillance equipment, whatever it might be; if this Congress refused to change that appropriation, I am taking the position that the President has the authority, because he is commander in chief at a time of war, to do an interdepartmental transfer and prioritize those dollars within the Department of Defense in the place that he sees fit because he is the commander in chief. Anything less than that, Madam Speaker, is something that ties the hands of the commander in chief and the feet and puts our military at risk. That is the effort that is coming from the other side of the aisle here. And it is one that will eventually debilitate

this country. This debate has encouraged our enemies and has diminished our ability to succeed.

And so if we look back at history, I don't believe there has been any time in history that this constitutional principle that I have laid out here has been challenged and been taken to court. And even then, I wonder how the Supreme Court would come down on this. But there were times back in 1973, 1974 and 1975, at least 2 of those 3 years, if not 3 of those 3 years, when Congress put strings on Department of Defense appropriations. And those strings said this, that none of these funds and any funds heretofore having been appropriated, meaning any money that is out there in the pipeline now, none of these funds can be spent in either North Vietnam, South Vietnam, Laos or Cambodia. And it shall not be used in the skies over those four countries or offshore from those four countries. So none of our appropriations money could be used there by the restrictions that were put on by this Congress, the micromanagement of this Congress.

But the fact was that we pulled our troops out of Vietnam at that point. It wasn't the President's intent to go back into Vietnam, but it was his intent to provide air cover. So when that message went, North Vietnam probably didn't have C-SPAN then, but they watch what goes on in this Congress, just like our enemies do in Iraq and the Middle East today; they understood that Congress had lost its will to conduct war in Vietnam. And they began to marshal their forces and provide the munitions and the armament necessary to mount the invasion, which they did in the spring of 1975. And in the aftermath of Congress micromanaging a nonshooting war, 3 million people died in the South China Sea, in South Vietnam and in the countries of Laos and Cambodia, 3 million people, because Congress injected themselves into a decision that was made by the commander in chief.

But the commander in chief didn't challenge that. The commander in chief at the time, the initial one was President Nixon, who was very weak politically. And then, of course, the appointed, not elected, President Ford, whom I revere, neither challenged that restriction put on by Congress.

So I don't believe we have a constitutional challenge that has taken place because President Ford and President Nixon did not challenge the Congress when they began to tie the strings in Vietnam.

This Congress is preparing to tie the strings. And I am saying to the public, Madam Speaker, and to the President, my position is I am going to uphold this Constitution. I'm going to defend the President's right to do interdepartmental transfers of funds if they think they are going to tie strings to this. I think the President can ignore any conditions that this House puts on him if the money is appropriated at DOD because that is his responsibility as

commander in chief, not the responsibility of this Congress, not the Pelosi Congress, not the Murtha Congress, but the President of the United States is the commander in chief.

In fact, I believe the last gentleman I mentioned would like to be the commander in chief. And given some of the legislation that he has drafted and introduced in this Congress, I think he would probably squeal had he been the commander in chief and someone tried to put the strings on him that he has tried to put on the White House.

And I would add that, in the Department of Defense appropriations bill last year, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) was able to slip language into that appropriations bill that would prohibit any basing agreements from being negotiated in Iraq. He stated that it was for permanent bases, but the language said any bases. And there was misinformation that was brought to this floor. And my amendment that tried to strip that out of the appropriations bill failed here on this floor, which compelled me to go to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and ask for a letter to support my amendment, which we put to the conference committee. And that letter then was enough to get that stripped out of the language.

That is the kind of thing that is going on; that would have us already moving out of Iraq if General Pace hadn't agreed with me and made that request of the conference committee. And so the conference report came without that language, and we were able to keep our operations going in Iraq. It was that close in a Republican majority. And now you see what's coming, Madam Speaker, under this new majority.

And here are some of the bullet points that come up on this subject that would come from the majority side of the aisle. This new appropriations, the strings that would be tied, the strings that I contend are unconstitutional, one would be, the legislation prohibits the deployment of troops who are not fully mission capable. Now, who would decide that? A definition apparently that is identified by the majority here in this Congress.

There are a list of other conditions in this, but I also recognize that the gentleman from Arizona, who has a heart full of appreciation for our troops and the Constitution, is on the floor. I would be very happy to yield so much time as he may consume, Mr. SHADEGG.

Mr. SHADEGG. I thank the gentleman for yielding and appreciate his taking the time to bring this message here to the floor and to talk about it.

I guess my curiosity or my interest is piqued by you talking about the conditions that are placed in this bill. I will tell you that I fundamentally do not believe that you can justify, that any nation could ever justify, announcing, while their troops were in the field in the middle of a war, announcing that on a date certain in the future, we are

going to unilaterally stop. It seems to me that the illogic of that should be apparent to everybody, but even perhaps the immorality of that should be important. How do we say to troops, well, fight until August of 2008, and then, by the click of a tock on the arm of a clock, by the hand going one more notch until it now becomes August 2008, the fight is over. To me, that makes no sense. And I think it is important that the Nation have a discussion about whether that policy makes any sense.

I would like to discuss it from two points of view. First of all, will withdrawing from Iraq end the war? I think that is a fair question. Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle say, if we withdraw from Iraq, if we so called "re-deploy," that will end the war. Well, I think that is worth discussing, and I think that is an important issue. But I think there is another important issue, and that issue is, what do we owe to the people of Iraq? And on that latter point, I want to note that this morning a reporter for UPI appeared on Washington Journal; her name is Pamela Hess. She has written a series of articles that, as you know, in Washington Journal, they have callers call in. And a caller called in and said, look, this is an unjustified war; we are never going to win, all the various arguments. And she said, well, I would like to suggest, and she was not taking anybody's side in the fight; she said, I would like to suggest that it is important for us to recognize that while one can criticize or analyze the reasons why we went to war, and that is one set of facts and circumstances, one can also look at why we are there now. And interestingly, her assertion is one that I have made, and she laid out an explanation. She said, having come into Iraq as we did, having dismantled their army, sent them packing, having dismantled their police forces, sent them packing, having dismantled, disassembled, taken apart their government, we created a situation where there was chaos.

□ 1515

Ms. Hess, in her comments on Washington Journal this morning, said, stop for a moment and imagine if another country had invaded the United States and if they had wiped out our Army and wiped out and disbanded our police forces and sent them home and then taken down our government. How long would it take before even here in the United States we began to see chaos, not unlike the chaos you see on the streets in Iraq?

And her argument was one that I think is the other important argument which is not being made in this debate. The one, as I mentioned, is if we retreat, if we embrace defeat, as our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are urging us to do, and say we cannot win in Iraq, let us leave and let us leave by a date certain, my first argument is, we can leave but the war will not end. I would suggest they have al-

ready demonstrated they will come to the United States. They will attack us here. They will attack Americans and nonradical Muslims all over the world. They will attack us and other Westerners in Europe, in Spain, in Indonesia. They will attack us everywhere. So I will suggest the war will not end.

The second argument is, forgetting how the war started, what obligation do we have to assist the people of Iraq in reestablishing the basics of a government, of a police force and of an army such that they can stop chaos, they can stop lawlessness?

One of the ways that you hear people in the Middle East articulate this, and the ambassadors from Jordan and Saudi Arabia came and made this argument to us and I think you heard them talk, they said the United States came into Iraq uninvited; the United States owes it to the Middle East and to the people of Iraq not to leave uninvited. And then you ask them what they mean by that, and they mean the same thing that Pamela Hess said, which is we have an obligation to aid the Iraqi people at least until they can get a government up and functioning, an army up and functioning, and a police force so that chaos does not reign.

I think those are the two key arguments. I would insert into the RECORD articles that Ms. Hess has written since returning from her most recent visit to Iraq that document the things that have changed.

ANALYSIS: LOUDSPEAKER DIPLOMACY  
(By Pamela Hess)

RAMADI, IRAQ, FEB. 17.—It's old fashioned. It's low-tech but it works. One U.S. unit operating in Iraq has found the best way to win hearts and minds is to put loudspeakers on police stations. The speaker systems are erected over the police stations. The daily broadcasts are 10 to 15 minutes long. They are timed not to compete with the call to prayers, and the messages are written by the police and local political officials. Some of the speeches are copied onto CDs and distributed around town. The broadcasts include Iraqi top 40 music; news dispatches taken from the BBC and Al Jazeera, speeches by the governor and the police chief, warnings about high threat areas, and the national anthem.

"That's a pretty catchy song," said Maj. Dan Zappa, the executive officer of the 1st Battalion, 6th Marine Regiment, responsible for security operations in some of the most contested areas of Ramadi. "It's interspersed with popular music. We've got video of kids dancing, hundreds of them, jumping around."

"We have the police chief in western Ramadi," Zappa said, "and he's addressing his family, his extended family and his tribe." Said Maj. Tiley Nunnink, a guest staff member of the battalion sent by the Marine Corps Warfighting Lab in Virginia: "It's a vehicle for Iraqi policemen to say what they need to say to the people."

The loudspeaker program would be a gamble in a town without a legitimate local police presence. In that case it would just be the overbearing—and clumsily worded—symbol of the occupation trying to co-opt local religious customs, senior commanders said.

But they believe the loudspeaker broadcasts are part of what seems to be turning the population in Ramadi against the insurgency.

"The system's working because the local population is approaching the Iraqi police with valuable information to help put down criminal acts—roadside bombs, building IEDs, stuff like that," Zappa said.

"Those are definitely the metrics, how does the population respond to this?" Nunnink said. "You can hear it in the broadcast. The broadcast says thank you for providing this information. You're contributing to the further security of the city."

The loudspeaker initiative addresses a huge hole in U.S. warfighting capabilities in Iraq: Insurgents can turn around videos of successful attacks on U.S. convoys, or dead Iraqi soldiers, or doctored or misrepresented footage of events within hours, sometimes before those events have even been reported to American headquarters. The videos show up on racks of bootlegged DVDs and CDs that seem to be for sale on nearly every street corner almost instantaneously.

Deployed U.S. forces however, do not have the authority to respond directly on their own; "information operations" products and messages have to be approved at high levels in the chain of command. That takes time, and by the time the message is approved, the story has moved on. Score one for the adversary.

"I have the power to call in a lethal air strike but not to respond to an insurgent video," one senior U.S. commander told UPI this week.

"We've been getting our butt kicked by the (local) media," Zappa said. "There would be an incident when they would blow up a Humvee and kill two Marines and wound civilians, and they would turn that around and say that we wounded the civilians."

"That's how information travels out here, by word of mouth," Nunnink said. "So the question was, how are we going to compete with that?"

Ramadi is notorious as one of the bloodiest battlefields for U.S. forces.

"There are local Iraqis doing great things for the community, innocent civilians, heroes, trying to put down the insurgents," said Zappa, a native of Pittsburgh. "They are out there but they don't have the ability to get the voice that the insurgents do. So that population sitting on the fence doesn't know, doesn't understand because they are not in receive mode of that information."

For the last four years, U.S. forces have tried hosting daily radio shows or cobbling together television broadcasts to try to win the loyalty of the people. They hand out flyers promising additional reconstruction funds if violence ebbs. None of the delivery methods are really ideal for this culture; the flyers go unread, the television and radio require a recalcitrant public to actively tune in to listen. But one thing everyone listens to is the booming call to prayers from the local mosque's loudspeakers, five times a day, plus a sermon on Friday.

Zappa and Nunnink and several other headquarters officers meet weekly to discuss the "non-kinetic" campaign—that is, all the non-lethal activities the battalion conducts.

"Our approach was what can we do that is gonna be more effective. We can kill bad guys all day but you're never gonna kill enough of them; They are always gonna create more. So we ask, what do the people really need? What's gonna give a tactical advantage? What's gonna get the Iraqi army, get the police out there? These are the things that drove us," Zappa said.

"We realized the opportunity was here if we could convince people the insurgency is not supporting them, it was destroying their city . . . it was just offering chaos, and capitalize on that, and the little successes that

these (Iraqi police) guys were bringing to the table."

It was in one of these meetings they came up with the notion of a loudspeaker campaign of their own.

ANALYSIS: THE U.S. WAR OF IDEAS  
(By Pamela Hess)

WASHINGTON, JAN. 5.—As the "global war on terrorism" enters its sixth year, the United States government is beginning to rethink its approach to the larger battle—the so-called "war of ideas."

The war on terror is, at its heart, a physical fight against extremists. The war of ideas, on the other hand, is a philosophical debate that pits extremist ideology in the Muslim world against tolerance and freedom. So far, however, the United States seems to be losing.

A Zogby International poll released in December shows that the vast majority of Arabs in five key countries view the United States and its policies in a strongly negative light. In two countries, Jordan and Morocco, attitudes have declined precipitously in the last year.

U.S. government officials are grappling with how to win the war of ideas, and some are embracing fresh conclusions: that U.S. actions speak louder than any propaganda it can put forth; that the promotion of democracy should be a sidecar to providing humanitarian aid and economic development in the Arab world; and acceptance that the United States has only a peripheral role to play in the core philosophical debate central to the war of ideas.

"I think we have to think about influencing people. The way we influence people is not just what we say, but by what we do and who we are," a Pentagon official closely involved in the Defense Department's piece of the war of ideas, told UPI last month. "It is not primarily about messaging." For 40 years during the Cold War, the U.S. waged a war of ideas against communism and totalitarianism, and won.

"During the Cold War, that was arguably easier to do because the Soviet Union was oppressing people. It was an easier argument to make, and (in Eastern Europe) we were more or less culturally on neutral ground," he said.

"... They didn't really know about us because they were in relatively closed societies. They didn't necessarily hate us," he said.

This new battle is more difficult and requires a different approach, the official said. "We are starting in the hole," he acknowledged. "In the Muslim world when 70 percent of the people are opposed to the United States, that's a much harder sell."

It does not help that many people in the Middle East identify their own governments as their oppressors, and the United States as their oppressors' allies.

"We start going in, we go in knowing they dislike us," he said. "It's gonna take a long time." He conceives the battle as having two major fronts, and in only one of them can the United States play a major public role.

The official said the U.S. should not be trying to counter terrorist propaganda. It should be finding ways to encourage competing visions within the Islamic world.

"In the strategic sense I don't think we need to have a counter-narrative," the official said. "The violent extremists, they have a single narrative. And I think from a purely strategic perspective we just have to make sure there are other narratives—not necessarily our own—that compete with theirs." The debate must be engaged by "protagonists within the Muslim community," he said—probably theologians from Indonesia, the world's largest Muslim country.

"We know that the (Muslim) community is much more diverse than it (seems). We have to find those people. I actually think we would do ourselves a great favor if we worked from the outside in, but look to examples outside of the Arab core."

There are "individuals who don't necessarily agree with the United States but who don't agree with violence as a tool," he said. "Supporting that is very important. How we do that is the tough part, because we don't want to taint them by virtue of overt association (with the United States). The government is struggling with how to do that."

The second front in the war of ideas is one in which the United States can play a direct public role: changing the conditions in the Arab world that feed terrorism—the lack of educational and economic opportunity, poor health care, and repressive regimes.

"Look at the level of despair in the Arab world. It rivals sub-Saharan Africa," he said. "That, plus broken regimes in that part of the world—it's a tinder box."

The official believes desperate conditions do not cause Islamic extremism. But they are what makes the Middle East so ripe for recruitment.

"They are the kindling of terrorism. They are what terrorists exploit," he said. "I think what the United States can do is essentially remove the kindling."

Done well, that could have two effects—draining the number of potential terrorist recruits and sympathizers, and demonstrating American good will in the Muslim world with actions rather than words.

"Think about Hezbollah or al Qaeda affiliates or ... (Muqtada Sadr in Iraq). What do they do? They don't stand on street corners only getting out proselytizing. They set up clinics, they give out food. That's their way of getting in," he said.

"If you look at the (U.S. response to the) tsunami, to the earthquake in Pakistan, the earthquake in Iran—that's when we got the biggest spike," he said. "Some of the things that have given us the greatest return are not the things we intended."

The Bush administration's emphasis on democracy building in the region is necessary, he said, but likely to fail if the "kindling" is not addressed.

"I do think you have to address the regimes. But I would say that the second-tier efforts, removing kindling (is more important). It's not just about notions, however justified, of democracy alone. It's more broadly about (developing a) healthy society, a civil society and addressing grievances." Moreover, what the United States considers a democracy may have to change if democracy is to be embraced in the Muslim world.

"We often ask the question... is Islam compatible with democracy? But we never question the other side, taking the religion as a given and seeing how flexible democracy is," he said. "We pay lip service to the fact that (Arab democracies are) not going to look like us. But I think we very rarely say we ought to revisit what a democracy is, and what role religion can play in it," he said. "If we do that we might be more flexible, and there might be different approaches that might be successful."

He is disturbed that pundits characterize the war on terrorism as a clash of civilizations. "That feeds our adversaries," he said. "The reality is I don't see this as a (rift) between Islam or between the East and West. It's a horizontal (split) within civilizations," he said.

ANALYSIS: IRAQ OUT OF TIME, NEEDS TROOPS  
(By Pamela Hess)

WASHINGTON, DEC. 15.—A leading U.S. military analyst is advocating the addition of

some 30,000 U.S. forces to Iraq, with a new mission: to protect the Iraqi people.

Frederick Kagan, a former instructor at West Point and now a resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute, believes his plan to add seven Army brigade combat teams and Marine regiments to Baghdad and Anbar province early next year could establish security in Baghdad by the fall of 2007. While much of the focus in Washington is on increasing the pace of American training of Iraqi security forces who will eventually take on the bulk of the fighting, Kagan argues the United States and Iraq no longer has that luxury of time.

"Iraq has reached a critical point. The strategy of relying on a political process to eliminate the insurgency has failed. Rising sectarian violence threatens to break America's will to fight. This violence will destroy the Iraqi government, armed forces, and people if it is not rapidly controlled," he writes. "Violence is accelerating beyond the Iraqis' ability to control it."

The surge in troops, if it succeeds in turning around the deteriorating situation in Iraq, would pave the way for a major troop withdrawal in 18 to 24 months, he says.

But the surge would also mean an increase in battle casualties, now nearing 3,000.

"Short-term increase in casualties is not a sign of failure ... As troops actively secure the population the enemy will surge its attacks on coalition troops and Iraqi civilians," Kagan writes.

He envisions a four-phase strategy in 2007: surging forces into Iraq by March; preparing for "clear and hold" operations by June; clear critical areas by September; and then transition control of them to Iraqi forces.

"These forces, partnered with Iraqi units, will clear critical Sunni and mixed Sunni-Shiite neighborhoods, primarily on the west side of the city. After the neighborhoods have been cleared, U.S. soldiers and Marines, again partnered with Iraqis, will remain behind to maintain security," Kagan writes in a new paper for AEI.

The clear and hold operation would be closely linked to a U.S. military led-reconstruction package with a fully funded plan in place prior to the battles so they can immediately pick up trash and get water and electricity working, area by area.

"Even large reconstruction efforts are cheap compared to continued fighting," he notes. It's an expansion of the tactics used with some success in Tall 'Afar and Fallujah but far more ambitious. Those towns were a fraction of the size of Baghdad and relatively isolated, making them easier to surround, empty and conduct house-to-house searches. Their size and location also allowed the return of residents, and potential fighters, to be managed.

Five U.S. brigades are currently operating in Baghdad along with six Iraqi brigades. In Anbar province, there are two Marine regimental combat teams and one U.S. Army brigade combat team. Together, they comprise just 52,500 combat forces in a total U.S. deployment of about 140,000. The remainder are serving in combat service support, headquarters, intelligence and other non-battle functions. Kagan's plan would bring the number of combat troops to 84,000 by September 2007, nearly a 50 percent increase in combat power.

Kagan is not alone in advocating a troop increase. Senior military officers who spoke to UPI on condition of anonymity say that having sufficient troops in Iraq to actually quell the insurgency and combat sectarian violence is the one approach the United States has not yet tried. Since the insurgency began in earnest in November 2003, U.S. forces have been playing catch-up, never having quite enough troops to both carry out

aggressive offensive operations and to maintain a daily presence in the areas already under control. That has resulted in a nationwide “whack-a-mole” strategy, they said.

When they have come down hard on one area, the enemy has squeezed out to somewhere they are not. The training of more than 300,000 Iraqi army and police has provided a “holding” force but their performance has been uneven at best, and in the case of the police, sometimes counterproductive. And the intervening three years has similarly allowed the insurgent and militia forces to grow as well, diminishing the impact Iraqi forces can have.

The answer, according to Kagan, is a dramatic increase in the number of U.S. troops assigned to protecting Iraq’s civilian population.

To get the number of U.S. troops up, Kagan proposes to accelerate the deployment of the next four brigades, now scheduled from April to February. The remaining BCTs would be extended from a 12-month deployment to 15 months. The Marine regiments would be extended from seven months to 12. That would bring the American troops presence in Baghdad up to nine or 10 BCTs, each with about 4,000 soldiers. The plan would also result in two additional Marine regimental combat teams in Anbar province.

Kagan would not pull forces from outside of Baghdad into that fight. Rather, he would leave them in place to continue their daily operations—preventing insurgents and sectarian militias from establishing a foothold in areas previously secured from them.

This military version of “robbing Peter to pay Paul” has been played out repeatedly throughout the war, commanders have complained. When they have stabilized an area, troops get called on to put out a fire somewhere else—leaving a security vacuum where they came from and inviting new violence.

If the clear and hold plan is carried out in Baghdad in 2007, Kagan writes that in 2008 the U.S. military could help disarm Shiite militias, stabilize Anbar or northern Iraq, and/or continue the training mission. Kagan concedes the potential responses to an invigorated American offensive in Iraq, outlining each factions’ likely responses, and the most dangerous short- and long-term scenarios, along with a plan to counter them.

Kagan also says the U.S. Army and Marine Corps must add at least 60,000 troops to their pay roll in the next two years and the increase must be permanent.

It is “vital to offset increased demand on the ground forces in Iraq, and vital to provide strategic options in many scenarios beyond Iraq,” he writes.

Army Chief of Staff Gen. Peter Schoomaker said Thursday that the most the Army can hope to recruit above the 80,000 a year it does now is 6,000 to 7,000 additional soldiers. Marine Corps officials believe they can add another 2,000 additional recruits annually. However, the Army and Marine Corps could likely retain far greater numbers of troops than they currently do. Re-enlistments and extensions are at all time highs, particularly among combat units deployed to Iraq.

Schoomaker also warned that if he does not get additional troops, and more freedom to use reservists to fill out the force, the Army is in danger of “breaking.”

Kagan says his plan will not break the Army: only four units would be accelerated to Iraq, and they were tapped to go anyway. Moreover, no unit will have less than a year between deployments under his plan.

“Losing now will certainly break the force,” Kagan writes.

Kagan could not be immediately reached for comment. An AEI spokeswoman said he was at a White House briefing.

As I mentioned, she has written a series of these articles. She went to Iraq, as she explained this morning on Washington Journal, to look at the question of how is it that our troops in Iraq feel they have such an important mission, feel they are accomplishing things. She mentioned that this was her third, I believe, visit to Iraq, and she said, this time, more than either of the two visits, she felt like our troops were more engaged, working more closely with the Iraqi people, felt a greater kinship with the Iraqi people, and felt like they were making progress.

Her purpose was to say, well, this must be just a myth. It must not be true that our troops are really feeling like they are accomplishing something; they are just parroting words given to them from the commanders and higher up.

But her pitch this morning was that is not true; that in point of fact, the thing that has changed was in part the attitude of our troops and the enhanced ability of our troops who have now been deployed there two or three times to speak Arabic, but also that the attitude of the Iraqi people has changed. She talked about how the Iraqi people are now rising up, resisting the violence, fighting back on their own and engaged in this battle in a way in which she had not seen before.

I believe this supplemental is extremely important to our Nation. I believe our confrontation with radical, militant Islam is the single most important confrontation we will face probably in my lifetime. I think back about the threat to world peace posed by communism, which is the threat I grew up with as a child, and I have to evaluate that threat versus the threat we now face with radical, militant Islam.

I have begun to read some of the writings on radical, militant Islam and what they want. I would commend to anyone who cares about this issue a book by a Yale professor by the name of Mary Habeck. Professor Habeck came and spoke, I think you know, to the bipartisan caucus on anti-terrorism and I heard her. I was very impressed. She has written a book called, “Knowing the Enemy,” and that book goes into detail on how the radical Islamic wing, the jihadi wing of the Islam faith, strays from the Koran, and how at times they have twisted the Koran, at least in her opinion, and have come to this conclusion that they must reestablish the caliphate, they must stay at a constant state of war, they want to not only reestablish the caliphate in its historical areas, but then expand it and at least require that every nation in the world be under the domination of radical Islam; and that everybody there has to at least be offered the opportunity to live under radical Islam. Then the question of whether or not they have to kill you if you do not remains on the table, but it is an excellent book, and I would urge that people read it. The other book that I would

say people should read is a book called, “America Alone,” by Mark Steyn.

Again, I think the challenge we face from radical Islam and its confrontation of Western society, ours here in America, Japan, Germany, France, Italy, Britain, is the single most important confrontation, single most important challenge of our lifetimes for us, for our children, for our grandchildren.

I understand the frustration of my colleagues who want us to get out and get out as quickly as we can. It breaks my heart. I have been there three times. I have seen grave errors made in the conduct of the war. I am troubled by the conduct of the war. I am embarrassed by our conduct of the war at times, but that does not answer the fundamental question. The fundamental question is: Can we leave? If we leave, does the war stop? If we leave, does it instead get worse?

I would suggest that if we leave Iraq, if we decide we cannot win there now, if we follow what the current draft supplemental proffered this week by the other side says and say in August of 2008, we are out no matter what, I think things do not get better. I would suggest that what happens is that the radical jihadi now in Iraq seeking to kill us there simply pick up their stakes, jump in a pick-up truck and head to Afghanistan, and suddenly we are fighting the same fight in Afghanistan.

I heard my colleagues on the floor and in the statement say we should be fighting in Afghanistan, and that is a serious fight, and the Taliban and the insurgency are re-arising in their battle and their challenge to us. I agree with them about that. But the problem is, what have we gained if we just moved the fight from Iraq to Afghanistan? And are we willing to stand up to the radical jihadi somewhere? Because if we do not do it in Iraq, I would submit we are going to have to do it somewhere.

I would also suggest that before we abandon Iraq, we need to think about what it is we owe to the people of that society. Having torn down their institutions, having torn down their government, their police and their army, what do we owe them to help them rebuild those institutions before we walk away?

And so I think the supplemental is very important. I think it is going to get a lot of discussion and debate. I personally believe that as long as you leave an arbitrary cut-off date in it that says we will be out of there as of a date certain, it is something I personally cannot support; and I would hope the American people would look at what jeopardy that places us in.

I think you also hear General Petraeus say, look, I just started this job. I need the troops to be able to accomplish it. There are early signs we are making progress. Give me a chance.

I think that is a plea that I hope we do not abandon. I hope that it is a plea



we acknowledge. I would agree that we cannot leave it totally open-ended.

I thank the gentleman for allowing me some time on this point. I thought it was worth my time to cite this reporter, Pamela Hess, and talk about her because she has just been there. She went with the purpose of trying to find out are things different, and at least as I heard her comments on Washington Journal this morning, she said things are different, progress is being made, and the Iraqi people are kicking in. She cited vastly better than I can examples of that.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG), and I pick up a point that Mr. SHADEGG made, and that is about what the enemy thinks and what happens if we should pull out of the central battlefield in this war on terror called Iraq.

So I am going to just make this transitional point here, Madam Speaker, and that is, I have a date written down here. July 11, 2004, I was sitting in a hotel in Kuwait City waiting to go into Iraq the next day, and I turned on al Jazeera TV, and I saw the face of this rather notorious person right here, Moqtada al Sadr, and he was speaking in Arabic with the English crawler going on underneath, and as I read what he said, and I heard it sparingly in Arabic, he said, if we keep attacking Americans, they will leave Iraq the same way they left Vietnam, the same way they left Lebanon, the same way they left Mogadishu. Moqtada al Sadr who has now absconded to Iran to be with his cronies who have been funding him, supporting him, sending him munitions and training him.

But the philosophy that he has voiced here is a philosophy that echoes back in the ghosts of Vietnam and through Lebanon and Mogadishu, and that is, do our enemies take great heart in believing that we do not have the will to complete a military task if it gets difficult or if it gets long?

So the voice of Moqtada al Sadr saying Americans will leave Iraq the same way they left Vietnam, Lebanon and Mogadishu will be replaced should we not succeed in Iraq, and I will point out that Prime Minister Maliki stood right back here at this microphone some months ago, and he said, if this war against terrorism cannot be won in Iraq, it cannot be won anywhere.

Our enemy will know that. We must succeed there on that battleground. The al Qaeda is in Iraq. They have come there to fight us. They have generated a few more out of the Sunnis there in particular; but if we pulled out of Iraq the way the other side would like to see that happen, then the battlefield does transfer to Afghanistan, and that battlefield in Afghanistan will be inspired by a failure to achieve victory in Iraq.

I would point out that the next poster you will see on this floor after such a time, if this Congress acts in a disgraceful fashion, then the next poster you will see will not be the face of

Moqtada al Sadr, Mr. Speaker, but it will be the face of Osama bin Laden himself and the quote will not be quite like this. It will be close, though. It will read like this: If we keep attacking Americans, they will leave Afghanistan the same way they left Vietnam, the same way they left Lebanon, the same way they left Mogadishu and the same way they left Iraq.

That is what is coming if this side of the aisle does not suck it up and understand that far more American lives are at risk if we do not have the will and the resolve to succeed. Playing politics with the lives of American soldiers and playing politics with the destiny of America just simply cannot be tolerated.

This supplemental appropriations bill, as it is announced to be written, and we do not have a draft to work with yet, is, I believe, an unconstitutional micromanaging of the powers of the Commander in Chief of the United States.

I wish to support and reiterate the statements made by the gentleman from Arizona when he said with the tick of a clock, the fight is over. Can you imagine, Madam Speaker, that a war would be like a prize fight and you would go for 10 rounds, or if it is a championship battle, maybe 15 rounds, could be 12, and when the round is over, the bell rings and the fight stops, and we come home on a date certain, at a time certain, without succeeding in a victory? That is an amazing and astonishing thing, and anyone who is involved in a guerrilla warfare of an insurgency against the United States will know all they have got to do is go underground, hole up and wait; when American soldiers are finally gone, whether lifted off of the U.S. embassy or whether they happen to be deployed out of their troop ships or flown out in jet airliners, they would know that then the enemy would have that battlefield to themselves.

The point made also by Mr. SHADEGG, we came in uninvited, we cannot leave uninvited. That is a profound statement that should be in the conscience of all of us, and we have made progress. We have made significant progress.

The attitude of the Iraqi people I thought was good 3 years ago or even 4 years ago, and I do understand that their attitude is betting better and better, but they are also nervous that we are not going to stick it out.

But if we should leave, there is no doubt things will get worse; and the worse that I would describe, Madam Speaker, is I do not think this is necessarily the worst-case scenario, but I will describe this as a likely-case scenario, and that is, right now Iran is fighting a proxy war against the United States. They are doing so in Iraq. They have been funding and supporting two large Shia militia. One of them would be Sadr's militia and the other one is the Badr Brigade. They have been supporting anyone who will increase the chaos and the disorder in

Iraq. They have not only been funding them and supporting them and they have been putting munitions into Iraq that are used against American service personnel and against Iraqi military security personnel. That has gone on for at least 2 years that I know of and it has gone on intensively and finally came out in the press a little over a month ago.

□ 1530

Iran is fighting a proxy war against the United States, and those who attack the United States and provide munitions and funding and training have a sovereign sanctuary to retreat to and hide in, and that is Iran.

I know of no example in history where you have had an insurgency that was funded by a sovereign sanctuary nation that has been protected from the assault of the troops that have been attacked out of that nation, and that prevailing side has always been the side that had the sanctuary, not the side that gave sanctuary.

I am opposed to giving sanctuary in Iran to them so they can fight their proxy war against the United States. If we have enemies, they cannot be hiding behind national boundaries. We must regard them as enemies wherever they are. But if we do not prevail in Iraq, and the pervasive influence that has taken place there by the Shi'a from Iran is imposed in the southern part of Iraq and also in Baghdad as well, which it surely could be controlled by the Shi'as, that would allow Iran in the aftermath with their hegemony to control 70 to 80 percent of the Iraqi oil.

If Ahmadinejad has control of 70 to 80 percent of the Iraqi oil, and about two-thirds of the real estate in Iraq and ultimately maybe more than that, his coffers get flushed full of cash. As the cash flows out of his treasure chest, he starts putting more and more money into his war chest, and that war chest becomes more and more nuclear capable, accelerating their development of nuclear weapons, weapons, in the plural, multiple plural, and means to deliver them, which means more and more missiles to put nuclear warheads on them, not just to threaten Israel, which Ahmadinejad has sworn to annihilate.

He has also sworn to defeat and annihilate the United States. Those missiles would not be constrained to just having the range to drop into Tel Aviv, but they would have soon the range to get into Western Europe and, not much later than that, the range to reach the United States.

This is a nation that has a suicidal tendency and a belief that they are called upon by Allah to annihilate the infidels. Infidels happen to be anyone who doesn't agree with them on their religion.

So think, Madam Speaker, in terms of a Middle East that is controlled by Ahmadinejad and the mullahs in Iran. They set on the Strait of Hormuz. If they have that valve, they will have

the valve at the Strait of Hormuz to control what goes in and what goes out, which amounts to 42.6 percent of the world's exportable oil supply. That is easily enough to make them filthy rich and easily enough to affect the world's economy if they crank that valve down and shut down just a valve, it is a figurative valve, shutting down the oil exports going out of the Strait of Hormuz. They would control all of the Middle East if this happens. Then this Nation would go into a recession, probably a depression.

If that happens, that reflects back to China, because China also is out there on the world market doing all that they can for the oil that they need, and they are dependent on the U.S. economy. The United States and China would be the big losers. Russia and Iran would be the big winners. Iran for obvious reasons; Russia because they have a lot of oil.

That explains why Putin has taken a hostile position against the United States. He wants things to go that direction in Iraq. He wants us out of there. He wants the Iranians to take over in Iraq because that helps his world dominance and that helps his power base. That is an equation that I don't believe is considered by the retreatniks that are writing these line items of micromanagement into this supplemental appropriations bill, this, I believe, it will come out to be an unconstitutional supplemental appropriations bill.

I would be happy to recognize the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. SHADEGG. I thank the gentleman. You hit upon one of the keys or at least one of the major concerns or arguments that I have over the idea of our colleagues that we can withdraw from Iraq and it will end the war.

You touched upon the fact that radical Islam teaches that they must kill all infidels. I make the point that, look, I understand the desire of people who want us out of Iraq to end the war and end the killing and to not have American troops on the battleground dying each day. I want that as well.

The question one has to ask is, is that a viable strategy? A lot of people think back to the Vietnam War and say, well, look, we ultimately made a decision that we couldn't win the Vietnam War. Indeed, as your discussion earlier in this hour pointed out, there were Members of this Congress who decided we want out of Vietnam; we are going to cut the funding back; that will bring us home.

Some could argue that with the help of this Congress, we did cut off funding for the Vietnam War, and the Vietnam War did end. I would suggest for thoughtful Americans looking at this today, we are in a very different world. To my knowledge, and I have asked this of a number of people, I know of no incident ever where any North Vietnamese leader had announced that, if we finished in Vietnam and left Vietnam, that would be insufficient. I know

of no Vietnamese, North Vietnamese, leader, Communist Vietnam leader, even leader of Communist China at the time, who said, as soon as we defeat the Americans in Vietnam, then we will take the fight to them in the United States.

That is a very, very, very, very different circumstance than we have here. Read Osama bin Laden. Read Ayman al Zawahiri. Read any of the leaders of the radical militant Islamic movement in the world of the leaders of al Qaeda, now thought to be reforming in the mountain areas of Pakistan and reasserting itself in a more cohesive fashion; they have made it clear. They don't want us just out of Iraq. Their goal isn't, if the Americans will leave Iraq, the war will end. They have never said that. What they have said over and over and over again is, we intend to kill the great Satan.

You talked about Ahmadinejad. He has given speeches in which he envisioned a world in which there is no Israel and a world in which there is no United States. How does one unilaterally declare peace? I think that is a fair question; could we have said at some point during World War II, you know what, we are losing soldiers in France, we are losing soldiers in the Netherlands fighting this battle, let's just quit, and the war will end? Or had Hitler said, I am going on, I am going forward, my plan is an Aryan domination of the world?

This is a different circumstance. The leaders of this radical, militant, jihadist movement have said, we must confront the infidel. As you just explained, they define it: Anybody who doesn't believe and practice Islam the way they believe it and practice it must be killed.

I think by announcing, as this proposed supplemental bill does, and the language of it clearly states, we will leave Iraq by August 2008 no matter what. We have to think about the message that sends. That is a very clear message. That message is, if you are Osama bin Laden hiding somewhere in Pakistan or on the border lands between Pakistan and Afghanistan, and you hear that message, and you know he is paying attention, and he has heard that message, what do you think? If you are Ayman al Zawahiri and you are his chief lieutenant and you hear that message, it is very clear: Hang tight, lay low, go to the cities outside of Baghdad, keep your profile low, kill a few people on the side as you are going, but don't worry about it, because, in a handful of months, maybe as early as next January, but, according to this measure that the Democrats announced earlier this week, no later than August 2008, the Americans will withdraw from Iraq, gone, finished, out of here.

You have just announced to Osama bin Laden: Hang on, hold tight. In August, the Americans will abandon Iraq. In August, the war will end, and you will have control of Iraq, assuming the

Iraqis can't defend themselves at that point, and you can take this war forward wherever you want to take it forward.

I don't understand the mindset of that. I understand the mindset of somebody who says, end the war tomorrow, let's bring them home. That is safe. If that's the choice of the American public, if that's the choice of the majority in this United States Congress, that is something, get them home and get them home tonight because they are safe.

But announcing that they will leave as of almost a year and a half from now, and between then they fight for what, is something I just can't understand. I do believe that Osama bin Laden and Al Zawahiri will understand that message.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Arizona. I reflect upon the last time we fought this enemy, and the first time that I know that we fought this enemy goes clear back into the early part of the 1500s, and I pick it up in a book called, "Christian Slaves, Muslim Masters," when the Corsairs, Barbary pirates, would set upon the merchant marines that were sailing around the Mediterranean; they also raided the coastlines from Greece all the way up along the coast, Italy, France, Spain, up to England and as far north as Iceland.

Iceland itself was the furthest, most northerly venture on the part of the Barbary pirates, who pressed 400 Icelanders into slavery, took them back to the Barbary Coast on the north shore of Africa and put them into slavery, where they died faster than any of the other slaves. But all together the history totals up about 1.25 million Christian slaves pressed into slavery by the Barbary pirates. This was just in the 1500s.

Now, the first shooting war we got into in the United States began right after the end of the violence in the Revolutionary War. We finished, the battle was over, and 1783, here in this country, we had the protection of the French flag for our merchant marine at that time on the high seas; 1784, we lost the protection of the French flag when we had won our independence. Between that period of time and our Constitution being ratified in 1789, the protection of the French flag left us.

So, from 1783 was when hostilities ended with Great Britain; 1784, the Barbary pirates fell upon our merchant marine ships, pressed our soldiers into slavery, and we had to build a Marine Corps and a Navy to go on and take on the Barbary pirates who were negotiated with in 1786 by Thomas Jefferson and by Ben Franklin and by John Adams. Jefferson brought a report back to this Congress, and that report is clearly a document within the history of this Congress.

It can be found in a report that is delivered over here in the Library of Congress, where he said that he had tried to negotiate with the Muslim leader at



the time, and he asked: Why do you attack us? Why do you kill us? We have no quarrel with you. We have had a peaceful posture with regard to you, and yet your whole regime sets upon us in the high seas.

The answer he got back was, Allah commands that we do this. He commands that we attack and kill you, or press you into slavery until you either pay homage or adopt and convert to our religion.

That report comes back from Thomas Jefferson. Those are the same circumstances that we are in today, just a few, couple 300-plus years down the line. Jefferson's analysis was, how do you negotiate with people who have a religious belief that they need to kill you in order to be saved? In fact, in Jefferson's report, the world of Islam over there, the Barbary pirates at the time said that anyone who was killed attacking the infidels would surely go to paradise.

He understood them. That is why he bought a Koran, was to do his oppositional research. That is what we are up against today, the same thing. If we don't understand our enemy, if we don't understand nosce hostem, which is a Latin term for, "know my enemy," came out of Romans, then we have the kind of appropriations bill that would have all these strings tied in such a way as the President can only deploy unprepared troops, and then it sets up some standards for that. If we need to defend ourselves, we couldn't do so unless we met this standard that is created by the other side of the aisle.

Mr. KING of Iowa. This bill presumably also requires the Iraqi government to meet the key security, political and economic benchmarks established by the President in his State of the Union address. That was January 10.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Iowa. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is interesting, since you were talking about history and since you have been using this quote, and I knew this before the gentleman got here, but the last time, to my recollection, that the United States Congress has cut off funds for troops in the field and demanded they be taken out of someplace was in November of 1993. It was a motion written by a gentleman from New York, a Republican by the name of Ben Gilman. It was brought to this floor by a Republican by the name of Jerry Solomon, and it instructed the Clinton administration to get troops out of Somalia.

I just think that is important to add, in a historical context, that this has happened before. In fact, Members through the Republican party have led the effort to get the troops out of a Muslim-dominated country within the last couple of decades.

I do want to remind the American people that you were not here for that. I was. I had to do a little research to

remember the exact set of circumstances, but I do think it is important to add to this debate.

□ 1545

Mr. KING of Iowa. I also recognize you are a fair-minded Mississippian, and I appreciate that and the tone and the history that you have added. And perhaps on your walk across here, you might not have heard my remarks with regard to the Vietnam era and the constraints that were put on the appropriations bill then. And so I don't think that we are in disagreement on the precedence or the history. We may or may not be in disagreement on the constitutional aspects.

And what I have done is taken a position that Congress does not have the authority to micromanage. And I was not here to put up a vote on that, but you can expect, Madam Speaker, how I would have voted had that been the case.

But these micromanaging efforts, and this is a newspaper publishing information, would appear to require that the Iraqi government meet key security, political, and economic benchmarks that were established by the President in the State of the Union Address on January 10. Now, those were goals at that time. I don't speak for the commander in chief on that, but I know now that we are well passed January 10. On January 10, there wasn't a plan that had been unfolded like the plan we are working on today. And you have to be flexible in a time of war. And to go back and pull things out of his speech and say, and we are going to tie you to that on appropriations, I think that does two things: I don't think that is prudent, and I don't think it is constitutional.

Another one would be the Iraqi failure to meet these benchmarks would mean the beginning of U.S. withdrawal from Iraq and will restrict economic aid to the Iraqis. Another case, Madam Speaker, of setting up a standard here in Congress, and the slow wheels of this Congress can creep along. And then we put something in place that would prohibit us, prohibit the commander in chief from being flexible in time of war.

It goes on. Another standard would be, if progress toward meeting any key benchmark is not met by July 1, 2007; we will hardly get any legislation passed before then; a redeployment of U.S. troops from Iraq begins immediately and must be completed within 180 days.

Madam Speaker, progress towards meeting benchmarks, that is a gray line, not a bright line but a grey one. Well, we are making progress every single day, but I don't think the people that are drafting this legislation would agree that we are making progress every single day. So, therefore, by their judgment of this standard, that would mean that we begin pulling out July 1, 2007, just a few months from now, and may be even retroactive, be-

cause I don't think this bill can get out of this Congress by then.

Another one says, if key benchmarks are not met October 1, 2007, a redeployment of U.S. troops from Iraq begins immediately and must be completed within 180 days.

It goes on and on. And, again, this is a huge, huge reach for Congress to get involved in the micromanagement of a war. There have always been consequences.

And, by the way, the gentleman from Mississippi that raised the issue of the appropriations bill in the early 1990s Congress that said, get out of Somalia, if you look at the aftermath of that, I think it would have been far better for the United States had we stayed and had we completed the mission there; it would be perhaps done by now and not a place where there are terrorists pulling into that. There has been a long, drawn out war in that area since that period of time that has washed back and forth across that countryside. And part of it is because we lacked resolve. And part of that is shown right here in the words of Muqtada al-Sadr.

So, Madam Speaker, I would bring up one more point, and that would be, we have made progress there. And the progress that we have made, some of it is measured by construction projects that are completed. There has been a lot that has been said about things not getting done in Iraq, and I would submit that I have been over there a number of times but twice specifically to review the construction projects that have been initiated and in progress and completed. And this shows in green the projects that are completed. Along that map, it is easy to see that we have got most of our work done. We are nearing the end really of all of them. The green are completed. The yellow is under construction, and the red are those that are planned but not started. Tiny little numbers under the red here. Big numbers under the green. Significantly smaller numbers than those that are under construction.

We have gotten a lot of projects completed, Madam Speaker, and we are almost to that point where we can wrap up this work that started here in Iraq, that started out with \$18.4 billion. We put supplemental funding in there. And then a final number, I can't speak to factually here on the floor, although it is significantly larger than \$18.4 billion. There has been a lot of infrastructure that has been picked up to speed. If you look around here on the edge, these are all border forts along the edge on the border between Iran and Iraq. That is also the case down along here with Jordan and Syria. We have fortified the border and put people there on the outposts. That has done a lot to slow things down, but it has not done enough to keep it from coming out of Iran.

I have been to a good number of these projects. Some would be sewer projects in Sadr City, Baghdad, itself that began about 3 years ago. And under the

first armored division controlling that, General Carelli, who is now the Corps commander there. I have been up here to the Kirkuk area where the mother of all generators sits there producing electricity 24 hours a day, every day, a gas-fired generator plant. There is work done all over this area. We have gone back and reflooded the swamps where the swamp Arabs lived that were dried up and drained by Saddam Hussein. They have moved back into that area. About 8,000 square miles were drained; we got about 4,000 square miles put back in. We have done a tremendous amount to improve the environment there in Iraq, and 80 percent of the violence is confined to Baghdad and 30 miles within Baghdad. So why would we be concerned that we can't control this or we can't manage this?

I would point out that, in 1944, on December 22 of 1944, the 101st airborne was surrounded at Bastogne, and the Nazis demanded that the 101st surrender. And General McCollum's response was a retort, it was "Nuts." The Germans didn't know how to understand that, Madam Speaker. But what it meant was: We are staying here. We have got you right where we want you. You are all around us. We can hit you. We can fire and hit you in any direction.

And the Americans underwent a relentless artillery barrage, but the response, the rhetoric, "Nuts" prevailed. And General Patton's Army was able to relieve the 101st Airborne. The 101st today contends they didn't need the help; they would have liked to just whip the Germans themselves.

That was the spirit we had in this country and our fighting personnel in December of 1944. When they were surrounded, and it was hopeless, they said, "Nuts." Now we have Baghdad surrounded and we have Baghdad penetrated, and all we have to do is maintain stability there, and we have people talking about surrender. And I think they are nuts, Madam Speaker, to talk about surrender with all of this investment in blood and treasure, to be so close to success and victory here, and to be waffling and go wobbly at a time when you need a spine and you need courage.

To bring this supplemental appropriations bill with all of these strings attached that are designed to appease the 75 or 76 members of the Out of Iraq Caucus and the left-winged liberals here in this Congress, not because of their leadership on war but because of their position on other issues, I think, is a disservice to the American people. The American people know how important this is. And the fathers and mothers, the widows and widowers, and sons and daughters of those who have given their lives for Iraqi freedom and a safer future for Americans must be respected and honored.

As the father of a son who was killed over there, a Gold Star father from California said to me, and his name was John, he said, "It is different now.

You can't pull out of there now, because that soil is sanctified by the blood of our children. You must stick with this battle and succeed and not lose your will."

As a major from Kentucky said to me the last time I was there, "We appreciate your prayers. We have everything we need to do what we have to do. We have all of the weapons we need and the clothing and the food and the training that we need, and all of the support that we need. So when you pray for us, pray for the American people. Pray that the American people understand this enemy that we are up against. Pray that the American people don't lose their resolve. We will not lose ours."

#### INSURANCE ISSUES IN WAKE OF KATRINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR. Madam Speaker, I have the great fortune to represent the people of south and coastal Mississippi, and I never want to miss the opportunity on their behalf to thank the other people of our great Nation for the help that has been provided to us in the wake of Hurricane Katrina, both individuals, Rotarians, college kids. But so many people have just been magnificent in their helping South Mississippi after the storm, and we want to thank you.

There has, Madam Speaker, unfortunately been a group that has been particularly unhelpful to the recovery of south Mississippi, and that is the insurance business, in particular the property and casualty business around the country.

I want to bring to your attention just one of the many of the thousands of homes in south Mississippi that were destroyed by the storm. The people there had insurance, contrary to what the Wall Street Journal will tell you. They had insurance against flood. They had insurance against wind. And when the storm came, they thought they were covered. And they woke up the day after the storm, and their homes were gone.

This is a sketch of Will Clark's home in Pass Christian, Mississippi. Being very fond of his place, he hired a local artist to sketch it. This is what it looked like the day before Katrina. That is what it looked like the day after.

Will, being a good businessman, had \$250,000 worth of homeowners insurance on his home. The folks from State Farm, within a few days of the storm, came to his property, looked around, said they saw no evidence of wind damage, despite all the things you see knocked down by the wind, and paid him nothing on his insurance claim. A \$250,000 policy paid him nothing.

The next homeowner I want to bring to your attention is the home of Mr.

and Mrs. James Scanlon. This is what it looks like. The Scanlons had \$304,000 worth of insurance on this home. The day after Katrina, it looked like that. The Scanlons were with Nationwide Insurance Company. Nationwide paid them \$13,000 on that damage. For those of you who have done some remodeling yourselves, you know that \$13,000 might replace that front door and maybe that window; \$304,000 worth of insurance paid them \$13,000.

The third one I want to bring to your attention is the home of Ms. Diane Quinn in Biloxi, Mississippi. To give you the magnitude of this storm, it stretched all the way from New Orleans to Mobile, Alabama. This is what Mrs. Quinn's home looked like the day before Katrina. She had \$249,000 worth of insurance with Allstate Insurance Company. The day after the storm, her home looked like that.

Within days of the storm, in addition to all the other trauma she had been to, the folks from Allstate, I believe that is "The Good Hands" folks, came and told her that they would give her \$10,000 for the loss of her home.

Mr. Speaker, there is zero Federal regulation of the insurance industry. When people came to me with claims like that and said, "What can you do for me," I had to give them the unfortunate answer, "Absolutely nothing." But it wasn't just these folks who were harmed by the storm, you see; it was every American.

The people that did pay claims was our Nation's flood insurance policy. The Nation's flood insurance policy is written in a way that we hire the private sector to sell that policy, and we hire the private sector to adjudicate the claim in events like this.

The problem that came in is, when those insurance agents went to those three properties, and even though the Navy tells us we had 5 hours of hurricane-force winds before the water got there, the insurance agents said, "We see no evidence of wind damage. So, therefore, we are not going to pay you on your homeowner's policy; you have to pay your flood policy."

Under the law, they are required to have a fair adjudication of the claim. And yet, at the same time that they require our Nation to have a fair adjudication of the claim, folks like State Farm and Nationwide are sending out memorandum to their claims adjusters, and this is a quote: "Where wind acts concurrently with flooding to cause damage to the insured's property, coverage for the loss exists only under the flood coverage." That means that not only these folks were cheated out of their homeowners policies, but you as taxpayers were cheated to pay claims that should have been paid by the insurance industry.

Now, the folks who run that company, a gentleman by the name of Ed Rust to be particular, rather than expressing remorse for what his company did to the people of America, was rewarded this year with a \$9,890,000 bonus